



GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND PROGRAM PLANNING

Fiscal Note 2017 Biennium

Bill #	HB0227	Title:	Adopting 2008 uniform interstate family support act
Primary Sponsor:	Dudik, Kimberly	Status:	As Introduced

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Local Gov Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be included in HB 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Concerns |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Included in the Executive Budget | <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Long-Term Impacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Revenue Form Attached |

FISCAL SUMMARY

	<u>FY 2016 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2017 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2018 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2019 Difference</u>
Expenditures:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Revenue:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Impact-General Fund Balance:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

Description of fiscal impact: HB 227 requires Title IV-D Child Support Enforcement programs to update their version of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) with the 2008 version of the Act. Montana is currently using the 1996 version of the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act of 2014. If passed and approved, this bill will have no fiscal impact to the state.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Technical Notes:

Department of Public Health and Human Services (DPHHS)

1. Failure to update to the 2008 version of UIFSA could result in federal disapproval of Montana's IV-D state plan.
2. If the Title IV-D state plan is disapproved, it may result in the immediate suspension of all federal payments for the state child support enforcement program, thus diminishing Montana's Child Support Enforcement Division (CSED) program.
3. It is assumed that the CSED would lose both federal funding and state special revenue, but would retain general fund and would run a diminished Title IV-D program.
4. Without a qualified Title IV-D state plan, the state could determine that it could operate a child support enforcement program with only general fund money. If that were the case, the CSED would not have use

of the locate and collection tools available only to Title IV-D agencies. These tools include federal tax and administrative offset, seizure of social security and unemployment benefits, federal financial institution data match, federal new hire registry, passport denial, and the federal parent locate service.

5. If the state were to have the Title IV-D state plan disapproved, the anticipated loss of state special revenue and federal funding for the CSED Title IV-D program for SFY 2016 would be \$9,251,617 (\$405,125 state special revenue and \$8,846,492 federal funds). For SFY 2017, the anticipated state special revenue and federal funding is \$9,428,224 (\$404,872 state special revenue and \$8,843,352 federal funds).
6. To be eligible for a block grant for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, the state must certify as part of its Title IV-A state plan that it has an approved Title IV-D state plan. Disapproval of a Title IV-D state plan may subject the Title IV-A state plan to review and potential disapproval.
7. If the state were to have the Title IV-A state plan disapproved, penalties up to and including withholding of the federal TANF block grant are possible. Current annual TANF block grant funding is estimated to be \$38,039,116.

Judicial Branch

8. The number of district court cases may increase as a result of this legislation; however, the Judicial Branch is unable to estimate the impact on judicial workload or the fiscal impact. The cumulative impact of such legislation may eventually require additional judicial resources because court dockets currently are full in many judicial districts throughout the state.

Sponsor's Initials

Date

Budget Director's Initials

Date